



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/728,325	12/04/2003	Michael J. Sosnoski	1842.168US1	7348
70648 7590 03/03/2008 SCHWEGMAN, LUNDBERG & WOESSNER/WMS GAMING P.O. BOX 2938 MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402				
EXAMINER				
HSU, RYAN				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
3714				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
03/03/2008		PAPER		

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

# Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

10/728,325

**Applicant(s)**

SOSNOSKI ET AL.

**Examiner**

RYAN HSU

**Art Unit**

3714

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 January 2008.  
2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.  
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7, 9, 15-19 and 21-24 is/are pending in the application.  
4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.  
6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7, 9, 15-19 and 21-24 is/are rejected.  
7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.  
8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:  
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB-08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_  
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_  
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application  
6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

### **DETAILED ACTION**

In response to the Request for Continued Examination (RCE) under 37 CFR 1.114 filed on 1/14/08. In response to the amendments filed on 1/14/08, claims 1-3, 6-7, and 15-19 have been amended and claims 8, 10-14, and 20 remain canceled and claims 21-24 have been newly added. Claims 1-7, 9, 15-19, and 21-24 are pending in the current application.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claim 1-7, 9, 15-19, and 21-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. There is no disclosure, teaching or support for the structure in a gaming machine to include "a second panel mounted in front of the first panel, the second panel substantially encompassing the first panel to protect the conductive material of the first panel" to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

**Claims 1-4, 6-7, 9, 15-16, 18-19, and 21-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable by Wachi et al. (US 6,833,665 B2) and Goodwin et al. (US 5,265,273) and in further view of Schneider (US 6,089,976).**

Regarding claims 1, 3-4, 9, 21, and 23, Wachi et al. disclose a visual display and a panel mounted in front of the display and revealing at least a portion of the display (*see 'flat display panel main body' [1] and 'front protective glass plate' [3], col. 4: ln 28-col. 5: ln 5*), the panel being coated or impregnated with a conductive material to provide shielding from electromagnetic interference (*see 'electrically conductive layer', col. 2: ln 35-55*). Furthermore, Wachi teaches of a front protective plate over an electromagnetic device that is a transparent substrate made of glass (*see col. 4: ln 60-65*). However, Wachi et al. is silent with respect to teaching a bezel encompassing the panel and being coated or impregnated with a conductive material to provide shielding from electromagnetic interference, the conductive material of the bezel being in electrical contact with the conductive material of the panel.

In an analogous display patent, Goodwin et al. teaches an electromagnetic interference (abbreviated to "EMI") device which uses an EMI shield that is grounded to the bezel of the device (*see Fig. 2 and the related description thereof*). Goodwin teaches that the bezel placed in contact with the EMI shield is made of a conductive material in order to ground it to the front assembly (*see col. 2: ln 12-31*). Additionally, Goodwin teaches of a second panel that is mounted in front of the first panel, the second panel substantially encompassing the first panel to protect the conductive material of the first panel and additionally has a bezel encompassing the first and second panels (*see elements [42], [38] of Fig. 2 and the related description thereof*). One would be motivated to incorporate the teachings of Goodwin to ground the EMI shield of a

display device because it provides an efficient and effective method of protecting using the structure of the existing display to provide the “ground” for an electrical circuit such as the EM shield without having to add any additional structure. This exploits the well-known principle in basic electronics that any conductive surface in which an electrical circuit is attached to may provide the “ground” effect necessary for the circuit to operate properly. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teachings of Goodwin with that of Wachi to provide an electromagnetic shielding device that used the conductive bezel of the device to ground the EMI shield. However the combination of Wachi with that of Goodwin still is silent with respect to a “processor operative to cause a wagering game to be displayed on the visual display”.

In a related patent, Schneider et al. teaches gaming machine that incorporates a video display monitor for the operation of an interactive primary game and bonus game (*see abstract*). Schneider teaches a gaming machine as an entertainment machine that contains electro-mechanical symbol-bearing reels and a visual display that is adapted to display the wagering game (*see display [40] of Fig. 1 and the related description thereof*). Additionally, Schneider also teaches of a processor operative to cause a wagering game to be displayed on the visual display (*see controller [60] of Fig. 6 and the related description thereof*). Furthermore, Schneider teaches a gaming machine to have visible devices that are selected from a group consisting of a bill validator, a coin acceptor, a printer, a card reader, a card reader display, a secondary display (*see devices [20-25] of Fig. 1 and the related description thereof*). One would be motivated to incorporate the features of Schneider’s gaming machine with that of Wachi’s display in order to allow for the user of Schneider’s gaming machine to be protected from

electromagnetic radiation that would be generated by the display devices required to play the game of Schneider. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Schneider's gaming machine with Wachi's flat display panel to have a gaming machine for conducting a wagering game that had a display that would provide shielding from electromagnetic interference.

Regarding claim 2 and 16, Wachi et al. disclose a machine wherein the first panel is substantially transparent where the panel reveals the portion of the display (*see col. 2: ln 35-col. 3: ln 62*).

Regarding claim 6-7 and 18-19, Wachi et al. disclose a display wherein the panel is comprised of glass (*see col. 2: ln 44-55*). Additionally, the panel is coated with a film containing indium tin oxide (*see col. 6: ln 10-col. 8: ln 32*).

Regarding claim 15, Wachi et al. disclose an assembly for a gaming machine that conducts a wagering game, the assembly comprising: a panel positioned in front of a visual display of the machine and revealing at least a portion of the display (*see col. 4: ln 28-col. 5: ln 5*); and a bezel encompassing the panel, each of the panel and the bezel being coated or impregnated with a conductive material to provide shielding from electromagnetic interference (*see col. 2: ln 35-55*). Furthermore, Wachi teaches of a front protective plate over an electromagnetic device that is a transparent substrate made of glass (*see col. 4: ln 60-65*). However, Wachi is silent with respect to a teaching the bezel being in electrical contact with the conductive material of the panel.

In an analogous display patent, Goodwin et al. teaches an electromagnetic interference (abbreviated to "EMI") device which uses an EMI shield that is grounded to the bezel of the

device (*see Fig. 2 and the related description thereof*). Goodwin teaches that the bezel placed in contact with the EMI shield is made of a conductive material in order to ground it to the front assembly (*see col. 2: ln 12-31*). Additionally, Goodwin teaches of a second panel that is mounted in front of the first panel, the second panel substantially encompassing the first panel to protect the conductive material of the first panel and additionally has a bezel encompassing the first and second panels (*see elements [42], [38] of Fig. 2 and the related description thereof*). One would be motivated to incorporate the teachings of Goodwin to ground the EMI shield of a display device because it provides an efficient and effective method of protecting using the structure of the existing display to provide the “ground” for an electrical circuit such as the EM shield without having to add any additional structure. This exploits the well-known principle in basic electronics that any conductive surface in which an electrical circuit is attached to may provide the “ground” effect necessary for the circuit to operate properly. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teachings of Goodwin with that of Wachi to provide an electromagnetic shielding device that used the conductive bezel of the device to ground the EMI shield.

Regarding claims 22 and 24, Wachi et al. Goodwin and Schneider teach to form a gaming machine that has an electromagnetic display panel as a display device. The instant claims are directed towards the glass panels on a gaming machine to include artwork for the visual display. It has been old and well known in the art that surfaces of a game machine may be decorated with thematic artwork for a visual display of a game machine as to attract customers to play the game. Therefore the Examiner takes OFFICIAL NOTICE with respect to the limitations of claims 22 and 24 that one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that it was an obvious feature

to add artwork to display surface of a gaming machine. Furthermore it would have been equally noticed that adding artwork to the visual display would not change the structure of the game machine and it would perform the same function with or without the artwork. There it would have also been a simple matter of design choice to add artwork to the surface of a display apparatus.

**Claims 5 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wachi et al. and Goodwin et al. and Schneider as applied to claims above, and further in view of Takahashi et al. (US 6,884,936 B2).**

Regarding claims 5 and 17, Wachi et al., Goodwin et al. and Schneider teach a display that contains a layer that is coated with a conductive material to provide shielding from electromagnetic interference. However, Wachi, Goodwin and Schneider are silent with respect to the amount of shielding effectiveness for its display. In an analogous display patent, Takahashi et al. teaches a display shield film that is capable of reducing noise by a level of at least 7 dB (*see Fig. 22 and the related description thereof*). Takahashi teaches that one would be motivated to incorporate these types of electromagnetic shielding films into display devices in order to protect any harmful radiation that may be emitted from the display devices. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made that although Wachi did not teach a reduction of noise by shielded screen it was a property that existed and that a 7 dB reduction was capable of being performed at the time the invention was made.

***Response to Arguments***



Applicant's arguments filed 1/14/08 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. The applicant's arguments are directed that the prior art of record fails to teach or suggest the limitation "a second panel mounted in front of the first panel, the second panel substantially encompassing the first panel to protect the conductive material of the first panel". This limitation has been addressed by Goodwin in the rejection found above.

***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communication from the examiner should be direct to Ryan Hsu whose telephone number is (571)-272-7148. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30 AM - 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Robert E Pezzuto can be reached at (571)-272-6996.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 1-866-217-9197 (toll-free).

RH

February 21, 2008

/Robert E Pezzuto/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3714

